

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/625,777	07/26/2000		Tao Chen	PA000330	7872	
23696	7590	08/26/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
Qualcomm Incorporated				ZIMMERMAN, BRIAN A		
Patents Depa	artment					
5775 Morehouse Drive				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
San Diego, CA 92121-1714				2635		

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

~							
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/625,777	CHEN ET AL.					
•	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Brian A Zimmerman	2635					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 26 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (*condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appetexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application (1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper re ich places the appli	oly to a cation in				
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:						
(a) ☑ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c)	in better form for appeal by mat	terially reducing or	simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	l be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment				
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NO	OT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: 29 and 47.							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>15-28,30-46 and 48-50</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).						
10. Other:		Brian A Zimmerma Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2635	n				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)



Continuation of 2. NOTE: the broadening of claims 19,22,25,37,40,43 present limitations of a scope that has not been previously considered and would require further consideration.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the 112 first paragraph rejection of claims 23 an 41 has been withdrawn. In response to the applicant's arguments that the references do not show simultaneously monitoring the quick paging channels is not persuasive since Tiedmann shows simultaneously monitoring different base stations to perform soft handoff.